

Although Syncrude has great potential we have not, in my opinion, the technology to exploit our resource fully. Nevertheless, it is highly necessary for the industry and the government, indeed for all the sectors of our economy, to put forth their best efforts and develop this resource so that in the end we can find a way to produce cheaper oil from the tar sands.

The government cannot do this job alone. The government can help. Vast amounts of money will be required, and the federal and the provincial governments will be called on to make vast expenditures. But this is not an evil thing. Common sense dictates that they should participate. There is enough room in our economy for both government and private industry. They can work together as friends, not necessarily as enemies. Companies are not necessarily exploiters. Governments are not necessarily inefficient. For too long have such myths been perpetrated.

Surely it is the job of the government to provide the nucleus for an enterprise such as the one we are embarked upon. It is the job of the government, in conjunction with provincial governments, to bring forth a national policy and provide the oil we will require in the future.

An hon. Member: Why doesn't the government do that, then?

Mr. Anderson: I am sure that members of the House, especially my hon. friend directly across from me, believe that if we are to err, we should err on the side of having too much oil rather than too little. Some five or 10 years from now I do not think rhetoric will heat the houses of the nation, nor will rhetoric or political ideology provide oil or gas for our vehicles. The only way this will be done is by providing the technology, the money and the work needed now to get this project off the ground.

● (1510)

If we do have a situation 10 years from now when the world price of oil is \$4 per barrel and we have oil up to our necks from Syncrude at \$11 a barrel, I think that will be fine, because some day we will require that oil. Some day someone will look back and say that this House made the right and correct decision by making sure that for the next year, the next 10 years, or 20 years from now, there will be oil for Canadian industries as well as Canadian consumers.

I should like to conclude by saying that this strikes me as a parallel to the decision taken in the last century to build a railroad across this country which then had very few people. If that railroad had not been built we would still have very few people. If we had a government composed of some of the members of the opposition I would suggest, with all respect, we would still be talking about the national dream; we would still be using canoes and portages, and the national dream would have become a nightmare.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, it was very interesting to hear the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) endorse the building of the CPR. I do not want to go back too far, like my hon. friends opposite, but it is worthy of note in

Income Tax

passing just how difficult the predecessors of those in the Liberal party tried to make the building of the CPR with the number of roadblocks they put in the way.

Having said that, I want to agree with the hon. member in respect of the government's investment in the Syncrude project, along with Alberta and the province of Ontario. Our oil reserves are precarious and it would be tragic, in my judgment, if the Syncrude project were allowed to fall to the ground without the utmost effort being made to move it forward, even though it certainly does involve risks. It involves real risks, but presumably risks that are shared by private companies as well as by the governments involved.

Although it is not my purpose today to pick a fight with my friends in the NDP, I have to say that one of the most absurd things I have heard suggested in this House was the suggestion that the government of Canada and the provinces of this country should attempt to put up all the money, some \$2 billion or whatever is involved, to finance Syncrude, rather than allow some of the multinational companies to share some of the risks. I have seldom heard a suggestion, even from my hon. friends in that party, that was quite as fantastic or as foolish as that one.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I should now like to direct some of my remarks to those in positions of authority and responsibility in this country as I comment on the amendment standing in the name of my colleague, the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence).

I realize that we may not win the vote on the amendment, which I expect will probably take place in a few hours. However, we are pleased that those members of this House who stand four-square for unprecedented increases in government revenues as extracted through personal income taxes will have an opportunity to make themselves known to the House and the country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: It is worth noting in passing that when the minister talks about reducing taxes he does not reduce them, he just takes a little less than he would otherwise. If you allow for all the personal income tax cuts he has boasted about, the figures which are attached to the budget he presented in November show that, according to his forecast, he will be extracting from the personal income taxpayers of this country some \$1,215 million more than they have to pay in the current fiscal year. So we are also pleased that all those who subscribe to the doctrine of government spending, or government spending restraint if absolutely necessary, but who apparently see no necessity for restraint now, will also have a chance to vote against the amendment.

As for my party, which will be supporting the amendment, we are attempting to accomplish three objectives; one, to protest the government's continued lack of leadership and the growing lack of credibility in the face of severe economic and social problems in our country; two, to draw attention to the unconscionable increase in personal income tax revenues we have been subjected to during the last recent period; and three, to focus attention